LUCIFER.

THE LIGHT-BEARER.

CENSORED BY THE POSTAL AUTHORITIES BEFORE DELIVERY TO SUBSCRIBERS.
ENTERED AT THE CHICAGO POSTOFFICE AS SECOND-CLASS MAIL MATTER.

PRICE FIVE CENTS. CHICAGO, ILL., FEB. 1, 306 [C. E. 1906]. WHOLE NO. 1058

A LETTER TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT.

To the Honorable Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States.

Mr. President:—In fact and by virtue of the Constitution you are not only the "executive" of the people of the United States, but by your office, as its *title* shows, you are their presiding officer, and their chief representative for essential purposes. The people are equal in rights and privileges *because* fundamentally we live under parliamentary law, of which you are now their administrator, and the protector of the whole body or "house." You are to be addressed on a "question of privilege" by any citizen-member who learns that a serious detriment impends from which you are "to see that the republic"—the political body—shall take no harm, as the old Roman decrees used to say.

Circumstances have made me feel, and indeed know, that dangers impend which justify any citizen who knows the facts in presenting this question of privilege *to* you, which calls for the exercise of extraordinary constitutional duties, powers and measures *from* you in order to protect the people in their personal rights, liberties and welfare.

The greatest dangers to states are the result of slow and almost imperceptible accumulations and growths, like mountain avalanches, and which like them, fall suddenly as the result of some trivial incident or change.

Such incidents are the passing of the so-called Comstock postal laws in, and since, 1873; the precedents and convictions occurring under them, and culminating in the recent prosecutions and sentences at Chicago of Dr. Alice B. Stockman to pay a fine of $500 and costs, and of Moses Harman, the 76-year-old editor of LUCIFER, the "Light-bearer," to one year at hard labor in the penitentiary, which is to him practically a death sentence. These sentences are for a statute-made "crime" of mailing a so-called improper or "obscene" newspaper in the Chicago postoffice. The prosecution was attended by the seizure and confiscation of whole editions of the paper without any notice to its owner, editor or subscribers, upon the mere *opinion* of some postal official, and that opinion turns out to be this: "Any and all discussion of the sex question is obscene and so unmailable. The only occasion for any talk on such matters is in the private conversation of physicians with patients." That these were the words of the official is clearly proved, and that they were acted upon repeatedly is a fact indisputable. That they were a formal rule or "decision" may be denied, but that is not claimed; the action upon them is the ruling and precedent, and that is shown over and over again in these two and other prosecutions. This opinion has been practically accepted by the United States courts (see Judge Bethea's charge in the Stockham case hereinafter quoted), and it makes trial by jury a mere farce, a mere acceptance of that opinion from "the court."

These statutes, prosecutions, opinions, precedents and verdicts have become a fatal *danger* to the republic and the people, which the Congress, courts, prosecutors and postal authorities have all *estopped* themselves from opposing, and, therefore, the appeal must be to the extraordinary action of "the President," as above and hereinafter described. There is no other remedy, escape or relief for the people, and hence this letter.

The first and great difficulty is to *sense* the nature and extent of this new but really retrograde revolution which has imperceptibly grown over all, and rendered all branches of the government *except* our President powerless.

Look back for a moment to the stirring yet hesitating discussion in the conventions by which (1787-1789) the Constitution was adopted! Had it then been supposed for an instant that the innocent-looking postal clause, "To establish postoffices and post roads," gave to the federal government the power of unlimited censorship over the press and mails, and criminal jurisdiction to punish without limit for mailing any literature or thing it might declare unmailable, and which might be designed to affect objects moral, social, political or other *beyond* postal necessities, such as "frauds," "lotteries," "anarchy," improper literature, or that called "obscene," or that in any wise relating to sex or marriage relations or affairs, or "race-suicide," or indeed any subject *whatever* that the "Congress" might happen to deem injurious or objectionable—think you that the Constitution would ever have been adopted? No! It is as certain as the sun in the sky that it would have been unanimously rejected. Such criminal jurisdiction would have made the voice of Patrick Henry triumphant when he described it as "the grave of the liberties of the people." Hamilton's plea in the "Federalist" and on the floor "that the federal postoffice was "*only* a matter of public convenience" would have been met by taunting, leering repetitions of the word "only!"

The very fact that the federal postal bureaucracy is now exercising a Russian criminal "administrative process" over all of the subjects above named—a jurisdiction never dreamed of, much less intended, when those expressed and "limited powers" were granted by the states and people—should make us halt at once, and return to the Constitution as it was intended to be; that is, as IT WAS and IS.

The Constitution was designed and adopted to "secure" the reverse of all this, viz., "the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity," and of all these "blessings" the "rights" of personal freedom, and of free speech, a free, uncensored press, and of free, equal and inviolable mails, were the chief. Next thereunto were the rights of labor and of property honestly acquired. In these postal prosecutions every one of these rights have been remorselessly and even exultantly overthrown.

The postoffice has indeed become more and more a "public convenience," and the very substance and necessity of civilization. But by this plain, clear, palpable usurpation of "ulterior powers," and the espionage, decoy and censorship, with limitless criminal jurisdiction *thereunder*, it is now overthrowing the very object of civilization itself. It has become a "Trojan horse," introducing unawares and into the very citadel of our liberties the old enemies of the republic and their allies. Without these rights and liberties the welfare, independence and progress of our people is impossible. They are the substance of all that is superior in English and American character—all that is making them the leaders of the human race. They reach down to the very foundation of all that makes life desirable to a *people* that *would be free*. So sacred are they that their loss is the loss of all reason for living, never to be submitted to as long as life is left.

The surprise with which this growth of an inconsistent despotism in the heart of the great republic is regarded, *abroad*, *is* notorious and instructive. But with us the whole matter is suppressed, as if that, too, was "obscene," or as if it would not do "to see ourse'l's as others see us." Yet that sight is a helpful duty, and the last utterances of Mr. W. T. Stead, the English editor, author and reformer, and of Mr. G. Bernard Shaw, the celebrated Irish author

and playwright, may enable us to judge of our position in the world of taste and intellect.

In the last July number of his London "Review of Reviews" Mr. Stead says:

"The American law authorizing a postoffice official to decide what is and what is not obscene literature places an arbitrary authority in the hand of an unknown censor which would not be tolerated for a moment in Great Britain. The Comstock law, as it is called, is so obviously capable of abuse that from time to time men who hold the faith which Milton held in the liberty of the press have protested against such absolute power being lodged in the hands of any official. If, at this moment, this unknown bureaucrat were to decide that the Song of Solomon and Shakespeare's poems were obscene, anyone who sent a copy of the Bible or Shakespeare through the post would be liable to be sent to gaol on the charge of using the mails for circulating obscene literature. In a recent case which led to the tragic death of a friend of my own, the judge expressly refused to listen to any evidence as to the morality of the book in question. When the postoffice, he ruled, had decided that any publication was obscene, the function of the court was *limited* to ascertaining whether or not an attempt had been made to send that book through the mails. This law arms a postoffice official with absolute power to place whatever publication he pleases on a far more terrible *Index Expurgatorious* than that of Rome. Its existence in a free country is a temporary anomaly and an *intolerable anachronism.*"

To which a London critic adds:

"The Comstock laws and their operation illustrate what Whitman called 'the endless audacity of elected persons.' He might have said appointed persons, too. The moment you give a man power over his fellows he proceeds, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, to exercise it illegitimately if he can."

Mr. Shaw's article in regard to "Comstockery," which, he says, is "the world's standing joke at the expense of the United States," is found in the New York "Times," of September 26th ult., and Mr. Comstock's reply appears in the same paper of the 28th of September. Together they are very interesting and instructive reading. Mr. Shaw refers to the Harman case thus:

"The one refuge left in the world for unbridled license is the married state. That is the shameful explanation of the fact that a journal has just been confiscated and its editor imprisoned in America for urging that a married woman should be protected from domestic molestation when childbearing. Had that man filled his paper with aphrodisiac pictures and aphrodisiac stories of duly engaged couples, he would now be a prosperous, respected citizen."

In England and Europe where there is *one* Parliament, a general union of Church and State, and no division of government into *State* and *Federal*, Comstockery is indeed a ridiculous mystery. To U. S. the matter is too real and dangerous for other than serious consideration.

We have pointed out that it is a direct usurpation on the part of the federal government, in that it misuses the postoffice to get an unlimited criminal jurisdiction over "ulterior matters" which are not *postal* at all, and over which the jurisdiction is reserved by the express words of the Constitution to the states and people, and so is expressly denied to the federal government. This whole matter was tried out in 1836 in reference to the mailing of "abolition" literature. Henry Clay and Daniel Webster led the discussion in the Senate. Mr. Webster stated that all attempts to exclude or punish for mailing matter by reason of "its meaning, were expressly unconstitutional." The Senate, then filled with "great senators," and the country, including Mr. Calhoun and President Jackson, who had suggested the matter in his message, finally agreed or acquiesced. This precedent settled this whole contention, and, like the Missouri Compromise, it should have remained settled. What slavery failed to do, Comstockery, in the blind ignorance of well-intentioned zeal, has seduced our federal government into undertaking to do. As was shown in the "abolition" discussion, there is no need to make the U. S. postoffice our general censor and inquisitor with power to punish its victims to any extent it chooses. Every state has laws which it deems proper and sufficient on all such subjects, with courts and juries, and officers to enforce them. The evil and crime is not in the mailing, but in the circulation of the objectionable matter in the state. Whether it should be repressed or not, the state law makers, courts and juries are the proper judges. If the mail is used in the circulation, the postal officials and employes are always at hand, if needful as witnesses. This is as it should be. One universal censorship is ruinous to all free thought, inquiry, progress, liberty and originality. What is allowable and healthy in Vermont and New York may be found the reverse in Louisiana and Texas. Let the people of each state govern and judge for themselves. This is the *constitutional* way of safety, peace and health.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

DIVISION OF ACCESSIONS
JUN 21 1943
RECEIVED

VOICES OF THE PAST.

"If every action which is good or evil in man at ripe years were to be under pittance, prescription and compulsion, what were virtue but a name, what praise could then be due to well doing, what gramercy to be sober, just, or continent? * * * They are not considerers of human beings who imagine to remove sin, by removing the matter of sin. * * * Suppose you could expel sin by this means; look how much we thus expel of sin, so much we expel of virtue: for the matter of them both is the same; remove that and ye remove them both alike." Milton's Areopagitica (Speech for the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing).

"In a sinless and painless world the moral elment would be lacking; the goodness would have no more significance in our conscious life than that load of atmosphere which we are always carrying about with us. We are thus brought to a striking conclusion, the essential soundness of which cannot be gainsaid. In a happy world there must be pain and sorrow, and in a moral world the knowledge of evil is indispensable. * * * The alternative is clear: on the one hand a world with sin and suffering, on the other hand an unthinkable world in which conscious life does not involve contrast. * * * What would have been the moral value or significance of a race of human beings ignorant of sin and doing benificent acts with no more consciousness or volition than the deftly contrived machine that picks up raw material at one end, and turns out some finished product at the other? Clearly, for strong and resolute men and women, an Eden would be but a fool's paradise." John Fiske, in Through Nature Up to God.

"Whoever reads, with philosophic eye, the history of nations, and their laws, will generally find, that the ideas of virtue and vice, of a good or a bad citizen, change with the revolution of ages; not in proportion to the alteration of circumstances, and consequently conformable to the common good; but in proportion to the passions and errors by which the different law-givers were successively influenced. He will consequently observe that the passions and vices of one age are the foundation of the morality of the following; that violent passion, the offspring of fanaticism and enthusiasm, being weakened by time, which reduces all the phenomena of the natural and moral world to an equality, become by degrees, the prudence of the age, and an useful instrument in the hands of the powerful or artful politician. Hence the uncertainty of our notions of honor and virtue; an uncertainty which will ever remain, because they change with the revolutions of time, and names survive the things they originally signified; they change with the boundaries of states, which are often the same both in physical and moral geography." Crimes and Punishments, Fourth Ed., 1775, pp. 24-25.

"Suppose a print-seller, with a view to business, exposes in his shop windows a number of objectionable pictures, for the attraction of those only who choose to look at them and possibly buy them. I have occasion to walk through the street; am I a party? How am I injured? Is my sense of decency shocked and hurt? But if this is sufficient ground for public interference then I have a right to call for its assistance when my taste is hurt and shocked by a piece of architecture which violates the laws of high art. I have similar grounds of complaint when a speaker gets up in a public place and preaches doctrines which are positively loathsome to me. I have a right of action against a man clothed in dirty rags, or with pomaded hair or a scented pocket handkerchief.

"If you reply that in these cases my hurt is not painful enough to justify any interference with another's freedom I have only to cite the old and almost forgotten arguments for the inquisition. The possible eternal damnation of my children, who are exposed to heretical teaching, is surely a sufficiently painful invasion of my happiness to warrant a most strenuous resistance. And even to modern ears it will seem reasonable that I should have grounds of action against a music-hall proprietor who should offend the moral sense of my children with songs of a pernicious character. This test will not do. * * * No man has ever yet succeeded in defining virtue a priori." Wordsworth Donisthorpe.

"Freedom to speak or print does not imply the right to say or print that which shocks decency, corrupts the morals of the young or destroys all faith in God." Anthony Comstock in "Traps for the Young," p. 199.

"Another class of publications issued by free lovers and free thinkers is in a fair way of being stamped out. The public generally can scarcely be aware of the extent that blasphemy and filth commingled have found vent through these varied channels. Under a plausible pretense men who raise a howl about 'free press,' 'free speech,' etc., ruthlessly trample under foot the most sacred things, breaking down the altars of religion, bursting asunder the ties of home and seeking to overthrow every social restraint." Anthony Comstock in report to New York Society for Suppression of Vice, 1878. Adopted unanimously by the society.

"I accord to every man the fullest scope for his views and convictions. He may shout them from the house top or print them over the face of every fence and building for all I care. But the common law and statutes both declare he must do it in a decent and lawful manner or not at all. I am sworn to enforce these laws—this and nothing more." Anthony Comstock in Frauds Exposed, p. 408.

"By the grace of the everliving God the liberal's demand shall not be allowed." Anthony Comstock in Frauds Exposed.

VARIOUS VOICES.

Full name and address of writers in this department can generally be obtained on application to the editor.

We are always glad to receive calls from friends visiting the city. Take the Lake street elevated, stop at Ashland avenue, walk one block east, then one block north. Or take Fulton street electric car west and stop at St. John's place, alighting in front of our house. The Lake street electric and Paulina street cars also pass within a block of our residence.

THE GHOURKI, Morgantown, W. Va.—I bid you Godspeed in your work and sympathize with you in your persecutions. If the "Ghourki" can be of service to you command me. We who stand upon the pinnacles must receive the shafts.

THOS. HIGGINS, Monmouth, Ill.—Enclosed you will find $1, which please apply on my subscription to LUCIFER.

Sorry to learn that you must go to prison, but even that may be of some use, if like Debs you would take up the study of Socialism and learn that it is the *material interests* of the *ruling class* that demands the suppression of you and your teaching on sex and marriage questions. However, I hope you will come out of the experience with sufficient strength to keep up the fight.

JAMES F. MORTON, JR., New York.—You know how I feel without an expressed word at this culminating infamy. The days of sanity and justice are yet far distant in this country; but you are helping to make them possible. Your imprisonment will yet prove a boomerang, and serve the cause of free speech better than a host of phrases; and we who are still at liberty will fight harder than ever. The chief worry I feel is on account of your health, but I strongly hope you will come through safely, and live to lead us in many a good fight for liberty in the years to come.

MRS. ANNIE B. FISH, N. Y.—I grieve to learn that you really have to serve your sentence. It does not seem possible that such injustice could go on. I enclose my monthly 25 cents and wish some good could be done with it in your behalf. I wish I could send as many dollars a month, and if all of LUCIFER'S readers could send as many dollars may be their protests would prove more effective. I think the plan of C. L. James is a good one. I believe it has been suggested before. Now, what do I have to do in the matter? I wish to be one of the complainants. You see I would like to help in this struggle, but do not know how. I need not admonish you to have courage, for you have that.

E. C. MCDONALD, Buffalo, N. Y.—I ask your pardon for the delay in renewing my subscription. I read LUCIFER with a great deal of interest and take the trouble to send it to some friend. I cannot but admire your courage and persistence in still, at your advanced age, advocating your theories and endeavoring to shed light upon manhood. You probably will not live to see the fruits of your labors, but you are making a grand struggle and all fair-minded free-thinking men and women should be in sympathy with you.

You have my best wishes for your very laudable efforts.

Inclosed find $2, one year's subscription, and the other dollar to do as you like with.

E. O. PATTERSON, Durham, N. C.—I have just read a communication from Jas. F. Morton, Jr., to the "Standard," of Daphne, Ala., relative to the procedure and rulings of the postoffice department in the Moses Harman case, and I am incapable of expressing my feelings since reading it. If our Assistant Attorney General had a spark of purity in his heart he would see some things in the light of purity. "To the pure all things are pure." He must be of a low, base character, for "As a man thinketh in his heart so is he." If a discussion of the sex question is obscene it must be very indelicate to be sexed at all; therefore the Almighty inventor and executor of life must have made a great mistake in endowing the race with a sexuality. The proper use of any organ of the body is right and proper and involves nothing impure, but the abuse or unnatural use of these organs is what creates impurity, obscenity and disgust. The reading of R. P. Goodwin's preposterous ruling gives the knowing observer and thinker a clear insight into his character and disposition. I am inclosing herewith my check for $1 for one year's membership in the "Free Speech League." I would be pleased to have literature relative to its organization if you have any for distribution.

[This letter was written to E. B. Foote, Jr., M. D., treasurer of the Free Speech League.]

MRS. M. LILLY-SLAIGHT, State Evangelist Minnesota G. L. I. O. G. T., Hutchinson, Minn.—The other day I received through the mail from some unknown source a copy of LUCIFER. I have read it carefully and with much interest. I do not know for what purpose this especial number was sent me, but I have a theory that these things all tend to some definite purpose, and so have endeavored to discover just what its coming was to mean to me. I was much impressed with its mention of the sex question and approved of many of its sentiments, but could not form much of an opinion as to its specific mission from so brief an acquaintance. Also as regards the press censorship, I would like to know more concerning its action and the whyfor of it. Send me some more of your literature that I may judge if your cause is one I can conscientiously espouse. I would state in regard to the affair with Mr. Angell, as quoted by your exchange on first page, December 21, that it was a little mistake. It was not the postal authorities who held up his noble little paper of May, in which he spoke of President Roosevelt's hunting party, but the superintendent of schools, who refused to allow the bands of mercy connected with the school to receive them or make use of them in their monthly lesson; a matter of toadying to position perhaps, but not just the same as postal interference. I have this from my friend, Mr. Angell, himself. Pardon the correction, but I am sure you wish to be right.

THEODORE DEBS, Terre Haute, Ind.—I notice that the Supreme Court has affirmed the judicial outrage perpetrated upon you by the lower court. This was to have been expected, and will occasion no surprise among those who have had experience with these capitalistic agencies for suppressing free speech when its suits the ruling buccaneers of the system. Their crowning disgrace is your crowning honor, and the year of your sentence will hasten by many years the overthrow of their despotism. You do not need my words to sustain you. The great cause of freedom is sufficient for this and you seem to be her favorite son.

J. WILLIAM LLOYD, Westfield, N. J.—This is sad news that your sentence has been confirmed and that you must go to jail. I do not know what to say to you. Perhaps you do not need anything said. Your courage seems always competent. I know of no braver man than you, or one who has proved it better. In the history of liberty you must be reckoned (and always will be) as one of her heroes. But there will be more to follow you. This battle for free speech is irrepressible and in part, at least, must be fought out through martyrdom. At present it looks as if that was almost the only way. Remember, dear friend, when you are "behind the bars" that many a heart is beating in sympathy with yours, and with admiration and gratitude for your work.

ANNIE E. K. PARKHURST, Brooklyn, N. Y.—"Procrastination is the thief of time" is what I used to write in my copy book when a child, though I had no idea of its meaning then. But I find the old fellow has stolen almost a month of time since your last was received.

Personally I do not see how "The Right to Be Born Well" could harm any one who would read it, but I gave it a second reading, all the time trying to imagine myself a conservative person, and so long as I could mentally hold this attitude, could see how it *might* be considered very objectionable *applied to humans*. Of course it would be O. K. applied to *animals* and *vegetables* (a la government horse book and Luther Burbank's work in the vegetable kingdom), but oh, horrors! Human beings have so long ignored natural law in sex life that the average mind can see nothing but filth in the subject.

MRS. M. W.—I attended a lecture the other night by a reverend doctor of Chicago, who is on the regular lecture course of some bureau. His theme was "America," and he exhausted most of our English adjectives in lauding our government, especially that part of it known as the Republican party. He claimed that God and Roosevelt would solve the question of universal peace, and that the example of William McKinley repeating on his death bed the words of the hymn, "Nearer, My God, to Thee," would be a lasting tribute to religion and to American statesmanship. He then patted us women on the back (metaphorically) and told us what a blessed privilege we possess in being permitted to bear sons to run a nation like ours, and while he was busy on this theme a small baby in the audience made a little disturbance, not enough to worry any one but its mother, however, and he stopped and said:

"If the lady, ah, would kindly take the baby out perhaps it would be quiet. Ahem, I hate to speak of it, but *we* are so constituted that it makes *us* nervous."

The poor mother was much mortified, and the confusion of her leaving the hall was three times what the fretting of the child caused, but the reverend doctor was pacified and delivered himself of his peroration in good shape.

Why the lecture bureaus hire such folks is a mystery to me. Stale stories, encomiums on the administration, denunciation of anarchy and cheap compliments for women may suit some folks.

I do hope when our editor has to go to prison he will be comfortable. It's horrid to think of at all, but I am proud of him, and please give him my love and tell him I shall write to him as often as the rules permit. I had a letter recently from a woman, a LUCIFER reader, who has just left her husband. She has five children to support and is doing it by baking bread. She tells a pitiful story of the persecution she has endured and even the attempted * by her legal owner. There is scarcely a day passes we don't hear of these evidences of marital misery, and yet our law makers are striving to enforce legal marriage, and our would-be moralists are elevating their noses whenever they hear of any one who defies custom and man-made law.

[The word which should appear in the above is usually replaced by the phrase "criminal assault" in the eminently pure, respectable and proper daily press. Should LUCIFER give it place it would probably cause another confiscation and denial of right of transmission. Of government Edmund Burke said, "The thing, the thing itself is the abuse." But of this outrage, the most loathsome that can be perpetrated on woman, it is not the thing itself, but the naming of it that is the abuse! It was the publication of a strongly-worded denunciation of a similar outrage that incited the first of the long-continued attempts to suppress LUCIFER and silence its editor.—L.]

LUCIFER.

THE LIGHT-BEARER.

MOSES HARMAN, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED FORTNIGHTLY AT 600 FULTON ST., CHICAGO, ILL.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

One year.....$1.00 Three months .....25 cents
Six months.....50 cents Single copies..... 5 cents

Hereafter Lucifer will not be sent to subscribers after expiration of subscription except by special request. Please compare number on your wrapper with whole number of paper, and if your subscription is about to expire notify us if you wish to continue to receive Lucifer.

EASTERN REPRESENTATIVE:
E. C. WALKER, 244 WEST 143D STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

LUCIFER: ITS MEANING AND PURPOSE.

LUCIFER—The planet Venus; so called from its brightness.—Webster's Dictionary.

LUCIFEROUS—Giving light; affording light or the means of discovery.—Same.

LUCIFIC—Producing light.—Same.

LUCIFORM—Having the form of light.—Same.

The name Lucifer means Light-Bringing or Light-Bearing, and the paper that has adopted this name stands for Light against Darkness—for Reason against Superstition—for Science against Tradition—for Investigation and Enlightenment against Credulity and Ignorance—for Liberty against Slavery—for Justice against Privilege.

CONGRESS SHALL MAKE NO LAW RESPECTING AN ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION, OR PROHIBITING THE FREE EXERCISE THEREOF; OR ABRIDGING THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH, OR OF THE PRESS; OR THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE PEACEABLY TO ASSEMBLE, AND TO PETITION THE GOVERNMENT FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES.—*First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.*

AT THIS WRITING, January 30, LUCIFER'S editor is still at home. Why the execution of the sentence of one year in penitentiary is postponed is not known at this office. An effort is being made, so we are told, to get the case reopened, or failing in that to get the sentence commuted to a fine or a term of jail imprisonment, but with what prospect of success is not known to the prisoner or his friends.

SOME WEEKS AGO it was stated that no more letters to Theodore Roosevelt from our subscribers would be published in LUCIFER. Since that decision was reached a reconsideration of the matter has been had, and, as a result, one more is now printed, the longest and most elaborate of them all. It is believed that the old-time worker for reform, and leader in the ranks of revolt against paternalistic despotism in the postoffice, Thaddeus B. Wakeman, is peculiarly fitted to write such a letter, intended to influence public opinion. Thus believing we ask all our friends whose letters to Theodore Roosevelt have been sent to this office for publication to forgive the discrimination and join with us in a combined effort to get the letter of Bro. Wakeman, in LUCIFER and in leaflet form, into the hands of readers and thinkers everywhere.

THE OUTLOOK.

THESE BE THY GODS, O ISRAEL!

A week or two ago the richest of Chicago's merchant princes, Marshall Field by name, "paid the debt of nature," to use a common phrase.

Nothing strange that a rich man should die any more than that a poor man should do so. On the contrary the chief cause of wonder is that the enormously rich, the abnormally rich, should live as long as they do, when we consider the kind of lives that most of them are compelled to live—the temptations to which they are constantly exposed, not to speak of the rivalries that the possession of great wealth naturally engenders, causing envy, strife, antagonisms, jealousies that make the rich the targets for the deadly shafts of those less fortunate.

"They that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts which drown men in destruction and perdition," said one of old, and the saying holds good, in a physical and temporal sense, in multitudes of cases, whether its author had reference to a future state of existence or not.

That the very rich do sometimes live to great age is very true; such men as Russell Sage and women such as Queen Victoria being cases in point, but that these are rare is a matter of common observation; hence the prayer of Agur, "Give me neither poverty nor riches" would seem a wise invocation.

The thought uppermost in mind, however, when the above text was taken had reference mainly to the influence upon the coming civic life of our city, that will be exerted by the example of the lately deceased merchant prince. *What did Marshall Field do* that merits such honors as those so freely lavished upon his memory?

First—It is said he built up the greatest store, the most wonderful business enterprise of the kind, in the world.

Second—He gave to Chicago "The Field Columbian Museum," which when complete will probably be the greatest collection of the kind in America, if not in the whole world.

Third—He amassed a fortune of one hundred and twenty-seven millions of dollars by his own skill and energy in less than fifty years.

The young man just starting in life naturally asks, "How did Marshall Field accumulate this almost inconceivably great fortune?"

"Did he do it honestly?"

"Honestly or dishonestly, is it possible for me to acquire a fortune equally great?"

The answer to the first two of these questions is:

He used the "System"—the American "System," success in using which means *ruin* to competitors in the same game.

It means demoralization of body, mind and soul—more or less complete—of the greater number of employes, female and male.

It means degeneracy for the unborn, simply because the mothers of the coming generation must consume the best part of the child-bearing period of their lives in a nerve-racking, unhealthful struggle to obtain money enough to buy a social position, and money enough to buy an eligible *man* to become the father of their children.

As further illustrations I quote from Thomas W. Lawson, of Boston, in "Everybody's Magazine":

"One sees a certain man openly displaying five hundred millions of dollars, a sum which represents the life earnings of 150,000 of our population, and knows that this man has secured this incredible amount during forty years of his life.

"One sees the second highest and most honorable office in the nation, a United States Senatorship, openly bought for a few stolen dollars by a man who up to the very day of its purchase was a watch repairer in a small country town, and who had never done a single meritorious deed or been possessed of worldly goods to the extent of $5,000.

"One sees a wily adventuress secure from the banks, which exist only to safeguard the people's deposited savings, hundreds of thousands of dollars on her bare story that she was the possessor of some mysterious documents.

"One sees a $3-a-week office boy of one of the 'System's' votaries able to borrow for the 'System,' on his bare note, four millions of dollars from a New York institution which only exists to safeguard the people's savings—although the law says that such institutions shall not loan to any man on any kind of collateral, even government bonds, one-tenth that sum.

"One sees two men, drunk with their success, gouging and tearing at each other's hearts in Wall Street, and sees their gouging and tearing bring about a panic which takes from the people in an hour over a billion dollars and drives scores to suicide, murder and defalcation—the two men continuing meanwhile as ornamental pillars of society instead of wearing prison stripes.

"One sees a great railroad corporation, in which are millions of the trust funds of widows, orphans and charitable institutions, caught 'short' (having sold something it did not own) in the stock-gambling game and held up to the tune of ten million dollars by a reckless stock gambler, who says, 'If you don't settle to-night it will be twenty millions to-morrow;' and the toll is paid, while the great banker who conducts the release of the hold-up charges the further tribute of twelve million dollars for his services. And then one sees this twenty-two millions of 'commission' tacked on to the capital stock of the great railroad which is subsequently capitalized into a 'bond' and sold to great life insurance companies as a first-class investment for their trust funds.

"When one sees these things and a hundred other as rankly fraudulent, one should not wonder at anything American connected with dollars."

A year ago many people doubted the correctness of some of the charges made by Thomas W. Lawson against the American "System" whereby such fortunes as that of Marshall Field are built up, but these charges have since been abundantly verified as we all know.

Here, then, are a few only of the "gods" held up by the leaders of public opinion—editors, clergymen, lawyers, judges—for the American youth to adore, to emulate, to follow.

Is it any wonder we hear the distant but distinct rumblings of the coming "revolution"? And yet we do not despair. All along the line are signs of an awakening to a sense of danger, and of a determination to apply the only true remedy. In an article in the Febru-

ary "Arena," protesting against a return to barbarism through adoption of the "whipping-post for wife-beaters," R. W. Shufeldt, New York, has this to say in regard to the causes of marital unhappiness, and of race-degeneracy:

"Above and beyond all these various causes, however, is one that completely envelopes everything having anything whatever to do with the matter of the conditions under which the two sexes can happily and profitably be mated and their offspring reared to become normal men and women and sound, intelligent and progressive representatives of the race. This cause is the utter ignorance of the science of sexology and a lack of a thorough understanding of human nature in its broadest sense. Now what makes the situation still more hopeless, not to say dangerous, is that we have permitted to grow up in this country, under federal protection, the most vicious system of censorship that has ever disgraced a civilization. Under its rulings, not only has it come about that it is practically impossible to introduce into the United States the works of foreign writers of the highest authority on sexology, but any one attempting to publish, either in the public prints or in book form anything touching upon such vital subjects, not only places himself or herself in danger of fines at the hands of the courts, but of all other forms of legal persecution, including a term of years in prison. So with suppressing the information upon one side and ignoring the matter of crass ignorance upon the other, of such matters, the result is precisely what the courts and the clergy are deploring."

The outlook for the future, then, though dark and despairing, is not without its silver lining.

M. H

"TRAINING FOR FATHERHOOD."

Under a general heading "Straight Talk," a recent number of "Everybody's Magazine" contains the following:

"The letter in the July 'Everybody's' on 'Training for Fatherhood' interested me much, being a mother of boys. There certainly is a great lack of literature on that subject, as well as lack of training in that direction. 'My Wife and I,' by Harriet Beecher Stowe, is the only thing approaching it I ever read, until recently, when I have noticed a hint here and there, though not even 'three articles in ten months,' as your correspondent puts it.

"The saying, 'Boys will be boys' is taken too much for granted. It really means, boys will be careless; boys will be irresponsible; boys will be selfish, and, what is worst of all, boys will be more or less immoral. Consequently, boys grow up into manhood feeling that these are their prerogatives. No wonder there are husbands and fathers who are careless of how they provide for the wife and children, not feeling any responsibility in the matter.

"Others seem to think they have a right to as large a part of their income as they choose to keep, not realizing how the lack of her share may add to the wife's burdens. Still others appear to think the Seventh Commandment was intended for the weaker sex only.

"It is time parents and all having care of children were aroused on this subject, 'Training Boys for Fatherhood.' Proper training to this end would lessen many a wife's and mother's burdens, and would eventually make a startling change in the divorce list.

"St. Louis, Mo. MRS. A. H. B."

Yes, training boys for fatherhood is second only in importance, as a department of juvenile education, to training girls for motherhood. But while training in handicrafts, in the professions—law, theology, medicine, militarism, civil-engineering, etc., etc., is considered necessary as preparation for the duties and the conflicts of life, our leaders in church and state do not think it necessary to train either girls or boys for parenthood. On the contrary the knowledge of sex, through and by which function alone it is possible to become parents, is forbidden, is tabooed, is denied to the young, and those who would give instruction on this subject are branded as criminals and punished as such.

As instances of this, Dr. Alice B. Stockham, of Chicago, was indicted, tried and sentenced to pay a heavy fine for instructing prospective brides and bridegrooms how to use their sex endowment, their sex forces, in such way as to secure their own health and happiness and also the right development, health and happiness of their prospective offspring.

About the same time the editor of LUCIFER was indicted, tried and sentenced to one year's imprisonment for publishing an article on the "Fatherhood Question," written by a man, and another article by a woman, a grandmother, giving instruction to both sexes on the parenthood question.

If these writers had given instruction to breeders of plants or domestic animals, how to obtain best results through control of sex function, there would probably have been no trouble.

Why this difference? Are cabbages, potatoes, apples, plums, peaches, pigs, cows, sheep or horses, of more value than human beings?

Why should Burbank be commended for improvements in potatoes, apples or cactus, while Dr. Stockham is condemned and punished for telling how the human race can be improved by much the same means, namely, by widening the sphere of knowledge in regard to sex?

Questions such as these are being raised on every hand, as when the editor of "The People's Press," Chicago, says, in a recent issue of that small but very lively journal:

"Chicago has had another cat show this week and a dog, horse and livestock show not long since, which proves that we take an interest in raising fine animals, from hogs up, and give the raiser a *medal and cash prize;* but when Moses Harman tried to show the people the need of raising fine children and wrote some able articles on motherhood and conditions necessary to conception and bearing of children so as to improve the quality of the human animals, he was arrested for obscenity, and sentenced to the penitentiary. It's all right to talk and write of raising fine cats and dogs for old maids and *barren* society women, but don't talk or write of raising healthy and intelligent babies,—that's obscene and might shock the morals (?) of Christian (?) society."

A LETTER from California informs us that Lois Waisbrooker is spending the winter in the Santa Cruz mountains, that her health is frail and that a little present in the shape of financial aid, on the occasion of her approaching eightieth birthday, would be much appreciated. Though an octogenarian Mrs. Waisbrooker is still working for the good of humanity, especially in the interest of freedom of speech and of press. A line addressed to her at Gibbs, Cal., would doubtless bring a reply showing how her present efforts are being directed. Her latest book, "Woman's Source of Power," is a work of great value, being a condensation or resume of several larger books treating upon the same subject. The price is 25 cents; it will be sent post-paid from Gibbs, Cal., or from this office. None of the pioneers of sex-reform are more deserving of remembrance in the shape of a birthday present than is Lois Waisbrooker. Contributions for this purpose may be sent to her through this office and also through the office of the "Demonstrator," Lake Bay, Wash., and will be duly acknowledged, or they may be sent direct to the veteran worker herself, at Gibbs, Cal.

THADDEUS B. WAKEMAN'S letter to President Roosevelt, a part of which appears in this issue of LUCIFER, is an especially valuable contribution to the literature in defense of Free Speech and Free Press. We shall publish it in leaflet form and hope that all who are interested in this vital question will aid in giving Mr. Wakeman's work the widest possible circulation. Let us know, friends, at once how many you can use to advantage. Send any sum that you can to assist in defraying the expenses of publication, postage, folding, wrapping, etc., but let no one allow the fact of inability to send money stand in the way of ordering any quantity that can be effectively used. These leaflet letters are to be sent to congressmen, senators, judges, editors, postmasters, public lecturers, press writers and others. Often personal letters accompanying them will be found effective.

This leaflet will be ready for mailing soon after this issue of LUCIFER reaches its readers, and again we earnestly request our friends to let us have their orders as early as possible.

BOOKS, OLD AND NEW.

"Jeanette; The Reclaimed Delilah." "A Thrilling Story of Abandoned Life, by a Man of the World. Truth is Stranger Than Fiction." William Nicholson & Sons, publishers, London.

The subject of this booklet is not new. It is old as the history of woman's enslavement to man's selfish passion—of woman's confiding love and trust, and of man's betrayal of that love and trust. The author does not pose as a reformer, not as a philosopher, but simply as an observer of facts, an observer who has the power to weave those facts into one of the most absorbingly interesting stories ever penned.

The heroine of the story is a clergyman's daughter brought up in ignorance of what life means, and especially of what sex-life, sex-function, means. When driven from home because of the natural consequences of this ignorance, she tried to drown herself, was defeated of her purpose in a very remarkable way; joined a theatrical troupe and gradually drifted into the life of a "courtezan."

While plying this vocation the writer of the story made an effort to bring about a reconciliation with her father. The following paragraphs tell of the failure of that effort, and fitly describe, no doubt, the mental attitude of the vast majority of women thus betrayed and abandoned to the fate of a "common prostitute" in the great cities of so-called "Christian civilization":

"Poor Jeanette! Though beautiful as a Greek, she is superstitious as a Buddhist. How quickly she read in my face the tale of

my failure with her father! What strangely contradictive cogitations she creates in my mind when, on my trying to paint to her the fearful consequences of remaining in her present mode of life, she quietly says, "Oh! God is good; He will take care of me." God is good! And this said with full faith, in a *brothel*, and by a woman at the sight of whom pious people draw up the skirts of their garments, and flee as from a damned thing! Such is the effect of the fanaticism stamped into her by her self-absorbed parent—to trust in God when she should trust in herself.

"Poor girl, she is sore beset. The direful picture of herself shunned by all those more fortunate of her sex who should show her most sympathy; the thought of being unearthed from every hiding place, dragged out from every disguise, and driven over the face of the earth like a hunted criminal; the picture of herself a prey to all the infamy and degradation to which the prudish selfishness of our conventional life would subject her, did she attempt to renew her life by one of virtue—still hold her firm to her lamentable occupation, and stand in the way of every suggestion I could make to help her to freedom."

The writer of this story—which he avers is true "in its facts"—seems to have caught a glimpse of the right solution of the terrible problem known as the "social evil," when he says she should *trust in herself*, not "trust in God."

In order that she may trust in herself it seems plain that woman must first repudiate wholly the old idea that she is "fallen" the moment she transgresses the artificial code of morality laid down by priest, judge and Grundy.

In order to trust in herself woman must assert her right to all the knowledge possible to be obtained in regard to her own body and mind, and this knowledge she must have as soon as her mental faculties are sufficiently developed to understand the meaning of words.

The old puritan idea that ignorance is the best protection of virtue is shown to be false by the experience of all the past as well as by the plainest dictates of what is called common sense—which, however, is the most uncommon, as we all know.

"Jeannette" is well printed, as are most books made in London; 104 pages, and is sold at 15 cents per copy, postpaid. Having received a good stock of this booklet from a generous helper in New Zealand, we offer to sell it to those who may want to distribute to others, at ten cents each, while the supply lasts.

"*Marriage and Divorce,*" by Josephine K. Henry, Versailles, Ky. Price, 25 cents.

The writer of this well printed booklet is by no means unknown to the world of radical thought. In this essay she begins with the words "A Lance Broken on Behalf of Woman." Her opening sentences read thus:

"This pamphlet deals with the great subject of Marriage and Divorce from the woman side of the question. Men of all classes have given their opinions and legislated on the vital question while women who have been the victims of a faulty system have suffered in silence. Men have not solved and cannot solve it alone. It is a great subject and should receive all the light that human knowledge can throw upon it, and it is the duty of women to give their best thoughts to the world on the one subject that seals the weal or woe of their sex."

Mrs. Henry speaks of the consternation caused some years ago by the audacity of Mona Caird, when she seriously and pointedly asked the question, "Is Marriage a Failure?" since which time, now some twenty years ago, "it has been a burning question, and as well expect death to add luster to the eye or bloom to the cheek as expect to stifle human thought on this subject."

Besides Mona Caird, our author thinks that Grant Allen thrust a "two-edged sword" into the vitals of our marriage system—as when he says:

"Last and hardest of all to eradicate in our midst comes the monopoly of the human heart which is known as marriage. Based upon the primitive habit of felling a woman with a blow, stunning her with repeated strokes of club or spear, and dragging her off by the hair of the head, as a slave to her captor's hut or rock shelter, this ugly and barbaric form of serfdom has come in our time by some strange caprice to be regarded as positively of divine origin.

"The man now says to himself: 'This woman is mine. Law and church have bestowed her on me. Mine for better or worse; mine drunk or sober; I have tabooed her for life.' There you have it, in all its native deformity, another monopolist instinct in this monopolistic age, the deepest seated of all—the grimmest, the most vindictive."

But Mona Caird and Grant Allen were not more dangerous foes to conventional marriage than is Josephine K. Henry herself, as when she says:

"The Christian of Europe and America today, at the marriage altar, assumes control of the body of the woman; chooses her home; makes all the conditions of life for her; requires chastity of her and retains liberty and license for himself; has a legal claim to the children she bears, and if he suspects her unfaithfulness, he sets spies on her life, and inflicting more lingering torture than that employed by the Turk, he drags the woman into a prying, insolent court, composed of men alone, divorces her with contumely and makes her an outcast from heart, home and society."

That women are slowly waking to a sense of the insanity, the inhumanity, the irrationality of canon law marriage is indicated by such incidents as this related by Mrs. Henry:

"In Washington city a couple went to a magistrate to be married. The young woman, a high school graduate, on entering the magistrate's office, said: 'Say, Mr. Magistrate, if this man does not treat me right, and if either of us fail to live up to the marriage contract and are unhappy, can we dissolve this partnership?'

"The official was thunderstruck and said: 'Preposterous! No indeed! This is a life contract.'

"The woman turned to the young man and said: 'James, it is all off. I cannot make any such contract.'"

"That girl," adds Mrs. Henry, "possessed a superior brand of common sense, which if possessed by all men and women would save them from much misery."

Among the sayings quoted by our author is this from Landor:

"Death itself, to the reflecting mind, is less serious than marriage. Death is not even a blow; not even a pulsation; it is a pause, but marriage unrolls the lot of numberless generations."

Most sincerely would I recommend all of LUCIFER'S readers to send to the author for a copy of "Marriage and Divorce," and after reading pass it to some friend, or get up a club and send for a few dozen copies for general missionary work.

If, when Garrison discontinued the old "Liberator"—because he thought its work was done—he had carefully looked into the marriage and divorce question, he might soon have seen that there was more need of the "Liberator" in that field of effort than ever there had been in the realm of chattle-slavery.

Much the same he would have found, also, in the field of monopoly of natural wealth and of the tools of production—in other words, the realm of wage-slavery. But of these two the enslavement of womanhood and of motherhood is the worst, inasmuch as it more nearly concerns the life of the race—the unborn who must take the place of the slaves now toiling in the fields of unrequited labor.

"*Garrison the Non-Resistant,*" By Ernest Crosby, author of "Captain Jinks Hero," "Swords and Plowshares," "Tolstoy and His Message," etc., etc. Chicago. The Public Publishing Company, First National Bank Building. Cloth; handsomely bound and lettered. Price, 50 cents net.

For those who cannot afford to purchase the four volumes octavo, entitled, "William Lloyd Garrison, The Story of His Life Told by His Children," I would strongly recommend this comparatively small volume, which is much more than a compilation from or condensation of that larger work.

Opening the book almost at random at the seventy-first page I read:

"The non-resistant is no weakling. Garrison himself is proof enough of that. The very renunciation of physical force seems to give a new and loftier power to a man. No, the strenuous man is not the soldier on horseback with saber drawn, but rather the man with folded arms who sees a new truth and utters it regardless of consequences.

"No man can injure the man who refuses to be hurt. You may kill him, but you cannot touch the man in him. * * * The most influential men in history have eschewed physical force as an instrument. * * *

A WARNING.

"Let us beware, however, of imitations and travesties of non-resistance. It is no colorless, negative quality, and should have no taint of timidity, no suspicion of effeminacy. Let us be quite sure we are above violence and not beneath it. It is far better to fight to the death than to decline the combat from cowardice, whatever be the name behind which we mask it."

This seems to be essentially the doctrine taught by Emerson in his essays, especially those called "Self-Reliance" and "Heroism." According to Emerson, Garrison, Crosby and many more, the greatest of all the "virtues" is *courage!* This view is sustained by the etymology of these two words. "Courage" is derived from *cor*, the heart, the seat of life, the most important of all the animal organs. "Virtue," from *vir*, a "man." In all lands and climes the chief characteristic of man as *man*, is reckoned to be courage.

The mistake of all times is that courage is thought to be a physical rather than a mental quality. William Lloyd Garrison did much to show that the highest and truest courage is mental rather than physical, and that the highest and best *resistance* is what is commonly but falsely called "non-resistance."

The story of Garrison's life, as told by Ernest Crosby, is one of the most entertaining ever written by an American.

A CATECHISM FOR COMSTOCK.

O Anthony! Saint Anthony! Of virtue undefiled,
How shall we cast away the sins upon our conscience piled?
For all the world is going mad with questions turned to vex
The innocence we try to cloak about our native sex.

Whate'er we read, howe'er we read, with blinders or without,
The theme engenders more and more a taste we cannot doubt.
Its shame parades the modern stage, the novels reek with it,
Its fashions follow every age each kind of us to fit.

The magazines, the daily press, the pulpits, courts and all,
Of its unsatisfied distress to every nature call.
No tongue or language is exempt from all its songs and signs,
No censor held it in contempt till spoke your low designs.

Far from the city's dreaded slums we've sought the rural wild,
But animate creation there, undraped, is most defiled.
The vegetation, too, alas! the great division knows,
And every primal source of life in wild abandon grows.

"The Book" is built upon the scheme, and Law its passions tax.
The Art of Ages boldly laughs when e'er we turn our backs.
And now has Science to the world this heresy declared:
"Creation holds dominion here through sexes surely paired."

How will consistency persuade your law-encircled pride
To yield consent to Teddy's scheme anent Race Suicide?
How shall we search the scriptures far, through glasses safe with smoke,
To find the purity we need its license to revoke?

How shall we watch the turning tides? How shall the seasons keep
The hid, unsullied sex of us all passionless asleep?
How shall the music of the spheres be echoed here on earth
When you have locked away the joy that sings creation's birth?

O Anthony! Wise Anthony! Whatever shall we do
To neutralize the vicious thing that rends the race in two?
O would we were a neuter egg whose enigmatic state
Would charm away your snarling zeal and soothe your frenzied hate.

But, Anthony, mad Anthony, the sexes you will drape
Until all unexpectedly you'll wind yourself with crepe.
Then may you find an easy job up where the saints abide,
Supplying genders to the souls by nature thus denied.

GEORGE E. BOWEN.

PLATO VERSUS PLATT.

Long ago, Plato, who anticipated nearly all the advanced movements of our time, proposed that children be bred on the same principles as domesticated animals. This was very shocking to persons of refined mind, and they have protested ever since whenever some modern Platonist has renewed the suggestion. The latest protestor is William Platt.

Mr. Platt admits that, "if you look for no 'more than a healthy animal," the prescription is admirable. That is a great concession, to start with. If scientific breeding promoted general health, and did nothing more, it would be the most valuable discovery ever made by man. Of all the sources of happiness, health is undoubtedly, by far, the greatest. But health does not only promote happiness; if we take the word in its wise sense, to include constitutional vigor, it is also an important condition of intellectual efficiency. The longevity of great men has often been noticed. Take, for instance, the most eminent Englishmen who have died during the last quarter of a century—Tennyson, Browning, Darwin, Spencer, Carlyle, Ruskin, Disraeli, Gladstone. Of these eight men, five were over eighty, two more were over seventy-five and the remaining one was seventy-three. Some of these men suffered from bodily ailments but all possessed great fundamental strength of constitution, and the power of getting through a vast amount of work. Lombroso in "The Man of Genius" gives striking proof that great men are long lived.

Mr. Platt is certainly mistaken, however, if he believes that only physical health and strength can be produced by breeding. All experience shows that mental and moral qualities are inherited as truly as bodily ones, and can therefore be developed by selection as surely as bodily ones.

Throughout the whole animal world we see that different animals are as regularly characterized by certain mental as by certain physical qualities. The courage and ferocity of the tiger are inherited as surely as his stripes, and an antelope is as certain to be timid as a tiger is to be brave. The burrowing instincts of moles, the nocturnal instincts of cats, the curious social instincts of bees and ants, are inherited with as much accuracy as the structure of their eyes and legs.

The same is true of the domesticated animals which have been artificially bred by man. No person doubts that the bloodhound, the greyhound, the setter, the pointer and the bulldog have been artificially produced by human selection. Yet these animals have mental peculiarities as clearly marked as their physical ones. In some cases, indeed, the distinguishing characteristic of a breed is a certain mental trait. Of this the pointer is an excellent example.

When we come to man, we find that the rule still holds true. The force of mental inheritance in human beings is perhaps best shown in the case of mental disease. Lombroso has told us how eleven members of the same family arrived in succession at Connecticut Asylum. In the remarkable chapter on "Inheritance," in his "Variation of Animals and Plants Under Domestication," Darwin says: "Every one knows how often insanity runs in families, and some of the cases given by Mr. Sedgwick are awful—as of a surgeon, whose brother, father and four paternal uncles were all insane, the latter dying by suicide; of a Jew, whose father, mother and six brothers and sisters were all mad; and in some other cases several members of the same family, during three or four successive generations, have committed suicide."

The evidence for the inheritance of mental talent is not quite so overwhelming; nevertheless, it is very strong, as any one will see who reads Galton's "Hereditary Genius." There are some striking cases now in English public life. Balfour, the present prime minister, is the fourth member of the family of Cecil who has held that office since the time of Elizabeth. His cousin, Lord Hugh Cecil, bids fair to be a fifth. The coming man of the Liberal party seems to be Winston Spencer Churchill, son of Lord Randolph Churchill, and a descendant of England's greatest general. No doubt these men have exceptional opportunities, but hardly more than several thousands of others who show no ability.

It may be said that it is dangerous to breed from genius, because of its close relation to insanity, alcoholism and other forms of degeneration. Although genius has often begotten genius, it is also true that the children of great men are often very unsatisfactory. It may, perhaps, be an open question how far it is desirable to breed from genius of the highest class. This difficulty, however, does not apply to persons of considerable but not prodigious ability. Galton and others have shown that talent at least breeds very true, and genius usually springs from talented families.

To avoid frightening the timid, I may say at once that I do not propose the drastic methods of Plato. In my opinion, freedom would suffice. All that is needed is to have collective maintenance of children and payment of motherhood, and to leave every woman free to select the father of her child on each occasion. The great majority of women would be sure to select superior men, especially if public opinion held up a high standard in this matter. We would thus have an automatic method of improving human heredity without restricting the liberty of anybody.

R. B. KERR.

WHAT SHALL BE DONE?

Dear Friend Harman: When I knew that Dr. Alice B. Stockham was indicted by the same grand jury that indicted you, I hoped that she and her friends—for their name is legion—would take the case to the Supreme Court of the United States and secure a judgment from the court of last resort. But I see by the "Nautilus," Holyoke, Mass., that Mrs. Stockham, together with her business manager, have already paid a fine of $500, and thereby confessed guilt on the charges preferred against them and agreed not to send out any more OBSCENE letters to her patients. Obscene, in this instance, must mean any reference to the generative organs, their proper culture and management.

Now a very practical question arises: What will Dr. Stockham do in the premises? She has a large clientage who look to her as a teacher and guide in sexual knowledge.

Are these persons to be left without the knowledge so important to them? Or will Comstock, McAfee & Co. send a censor into the office of Dr. Stockham and expurgate the obscene parts from her correspondence and allow the others to go free? Can Dr. Stockham take a patient into her private office and give desired instruction in regard to proper use of the generative system? This subject is a large one and in the end these promoters of public debauchery and private ignorance may find that they have "bitten off more than they can chew."

This case of Dr. Stockham is the greatest outrage on human right that has ever been perpetrated on American soil. For one,

I am pleased that it has occurred, for it shows more clearly the animus of the promoters of ignorance than any event that has occurred since this persecution of truth, justice and knowledge commenced its work of sending people to prison for the simple reason that they were making an effort to enlighten the world in regard to important truths pertaining to the present and future welfare of mankind. Comstock & Co., are doing the precise work of the Spanish Inquisition, viz.: protecting church and state from the advancing tide of knowledge that threatens to overcome them. History repeats itself.

Protestants in this land of the free (?) and home of the brave are doing the same work that Catholics did in Spain some three hundred years ago, and for the same reason: Because they are ignorant.

The practical question remains, as Boss Tweed once said, "What are you going to do about it?" I know very little as to the case of Dr. Stockham, but of this I am sure: When persons holding the position of Dr. Stockham lie down like whipped curs at the feet of their tyrannical masters and confess guilt by paying fines, other and smaller men will have a mighty poor chance to obtain justice before such courts, and I am astonished Dr. Stockham did anything of the kind; in her surrender I read your fate.

Yet in all this I read the ultimate downfall of the cabal who have taken it upon themselves to hold all men, and especially women, in the dungeon in which they are themselves confined. Light is breaking in. The chinks will enlarge, despite the efforts of reactionists to plaster them up. The world shall be free in spite of the struggles of the ignorant to enslave it.

Your position in regard to this persecution is the true one. In the face of prison doors you have maintained the same calm demeanor, and have really offered the sublime petition: "Father, forgive them; they know not what they do."

This spirit shall win in this fight, as it has won in every other since the foundation of the world. You will stand in future by the side of Old John Brown and others that might be mentioned, whose souls are marching on because they dared obey the monitions of the spirit within in place of the tyrannical edicts of ignorant men without, who are laboring to prolong the rule of themselves and their class, and promote their own private interests.

But why do I talk, when *action*, and action alone, will secure the end sought? There is little use postponing or delaying the coming conflict. Come it will, and come it must.

H. W. HUNT.

Federalsburg, Md., June 28.

SUGGESTIONS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

In sending in names of new subscribers please state (1) if money for same is paid by said subscriber, or (2) is paid by remitter with knowledge and consent, or (3) without knowledge or consent of new subscriber. In the latter case, we want to write and ask if the person wishes to receive paper, so by having the information at first a great deal of labor is saved.

Those who do not wish to see their letters or names in LUCIFER should write "Not for publication" on each letter; for, while the majority do not object to their letters or extracts therefrom being used, a few do; and it would entail too much unnecessary labor to write to each for permission to make such use of their words.

LOCAL LECTURES AND MEETINGS.

Meetings of the Spencer-Whitman Center, 2238 Calumet avenue, are held Mondays and Thtursdays of each week. Lectures begin at 8 p. m. Discussions follow the lecture. All invited to participate.

The Chicago Society of Anthropology holds regular meetings Sunday afternoons in Corinthian Hall, seventeenth floor Masonic building. Meetings open at 2:30. All invited.

Chicago Social Science Club meets every Sunday at 8 o'clock p. m. in Hall 913, Masonic Building.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

WOMAN'S SOURCE OF POWER.

LOVE ATTRACTION, THE FEMININE PRINCIPLE, is the builder of all living forms. LOVE IS THE CREATOR.

In the inception of human life the first step is destructive of a previous condition, but when the work is given into woman's keeping the action is reversed, becomes constructive; from then on till growth ceases the feminine is the predominating power. Here is where the principle which can continue youth should begin its work.

BY LOIS WAISBROOKER.

Price 25 cents. For sale at this office.

1058

If these figures correspond with the number printed on the wrapper of your Lucifer, your subscription expires with this number.

If a copy of Lucifer fails to reach you, please order by number or date.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

What the Young Need to Know.

A PRIMER OF SEX RATIONALISM.

BY E. C. WALKER.

SUGGESTIONS OF CONTENTS: Is There Necessity for This Knowledge? Analagous Dangers and Safeguards. Unwisdom of Custom-Sanctioned Ignorance. Teachers Better if of Opposite Sex. Divisions of the Subject. Definitions of Sex. Evolution of Sex; Differentiation. Reproduction Less and Less Perilous. Inestimable Value of Use. Joy Is Positive, Upbuilding. The Deciding Majority of Two. The Tendency to Multi-Selection. A Serious Error in Exchange. Effects of Meat, Stimulants and Narcotics. Reproduction and Social Happiness. Not so Many Children, but Better Ones. Legal Intrusion Has a Limit. Voluntary Complexity, and Health. Comparative Exemption of the Jews. The Upward March. Cure and Irremediable Punishments. Origin of the Shame of Sex. Derived from Other-World Mania. "The Son of God" and Sex. Faithful Followers of Jesus. Relation of Past Asceticism to Existing Type. Mental Slaves Are Not Investigators. Remauld and Clarimonde. Sex Manifestation Below Our Race. Sex Inspiration in Human Endeavor. What is Immodesty? Primitive and Present Day Savage Customs in Dress. Civilized Customs and Costumes. What We Affirm on This Subject. Bathing and Dress. Asceticism and Honesty in Art. Arguments of the Puritan. Judge Phillips and Mr. Moody. To Take the Purity of Nudity in Art for Granted. Asceticism and Literature. Foolishness of Hiding Social Wrongs. Take off the Taboo.

Price, 15 cents.

MOSES HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago, Ill.

SOMETHING NEW

on an old and much discussed topic, i. e.: SEX REFORMATION. A new book entitled,

"THE ABUSE OF THE MARRIAGE RELATIONS,"

written by an old and experienced physician, who has investigated this subject and has found this to be the origin of most chronic diseases. This is a book for the married and those who intend to get married, and will be sent prepaid upon receipt of TWENTY-FIVE CENTS (25 cents) IN COIN OR STAMPS. For FIFTY CENTS (50 cents) we will send you the book and also enter your name for a four months' subscription to the live magazine "The NATUROPATH AND HERALD OF HEALTH." If at the expiration of the four months you find the magazine interesting please send us an additional seventy-five cents (75 cents) for the balance of the year.

B. LUST, N. D.,
124 E. 59th St.,
NEW YORK CITY.

PROUDHON AND HIS "BANK OF THE PEOPLE."

BY CHARLES A. DANA.

This is a defense of the great French anarchist, showing the evils of a specie currency, and that interest on capital can and ought to be abolished by a system of Free and Mutual Banking. A series of newspaper articles written by the after-time editor of *The New York Sun*, he having been a Brook Farm experimenter in early life. Price, 10 cents.

MOSES HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago, Ill.

MARRIAGE IN FREE SOCIETY.

BY EDWARD CARPENTER.

One of the best short works on the subject. A charming little gift book. "Love is doubtless the last and most difficult lesson that humanity has to learn; in a sense it underlies all the others. Perhaps the time has come for the modern nations when, ceasing to be children, they may even try to learn it."

DAINTILY PRINTED. PREPAID, 25c.

MOSES HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago, Ill.

AN ESSAY ON THE DUTY OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE. By Henry D. Thoreau. A reprint of this classic essay on the supremacy of the individual conscience. Antique paper; artistic covers, dark green on olivine. 10c.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago, Ill.

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL CARDS.

OTTO WETTSTEIN,

THE LIBERAL MAIL-ORDER JEWELER.

Now permanent at No. 110 N. Kensington av., La Grange, Cook Co., Ill. Can save you 10 to 20 per cent on Watches, Diamonds or anything in the Jeweler's Line. Write me and receive prices and my great little tract, "Theism in the Crucible," free.

J. H. GREER, M. D.,

53 DEARBORN ST., CHICAGO.

Office Hours—9 a. m. to 4 p. m.; Wednesdays and Saturdays, 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.; Sundays, 9 a. m. to 12 m. Telephone Randolph 61.

DR. OGILVIE A. RICE,
DENTIST.

1556 MILWAUKEE AVE., COR. WESTERN, CHICAGO.
Telephone West 141.

PHILIP G. PEABODY,
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW.
15 COURT SQUARE, ROOM 61,
BOSTON, MASS

MISCELLANEOUS.

CLAIRVOYANT REMEDY.

Mrs. Severance's Good Health Tablets, a mild Botanic Laxative. A positive cure for constipation and all resultant ailments. They ensure the full vigor, bloom and beauty of health. Remit $1 and four 2-cent stamps for tablets, and ask for a full free spiritual and health reading if you like. Address T. M. Watson, 1300 Main street, Whitewater, Wis.